

Remarks

Applicants have amended the Abstract to 150 words as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 1 describes “each of said second computers has a user interface to enable the user of the second computer to interact with the second computer system”. The Examiner states that “it does not make sense for the second computer to interact with the second computer system” at item 7 on page 3 of the Office Action of February 24, 2005. It is clear from Claim 1 that it is the user interface that enables the user to interact with the second computer, and that the second computer does not interact with itself, as the Examiner contends. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3, 12-15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,298,446 (Schreiber et al.) “Schreiber ‘446”. It is submitted that Schreiber ‘446 is not a proper prior art reference to the present application. Schreiber ‘446 was filed September 14, 1999 as a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/313,067, filed May 17, 1999, now U.S. Patent No. 6,209,103. The priority date of the present application is August 2, 1999 from U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/146,691, filed August 2, 1999. Thus, the priority date of the present application is before the filing date of Schreiber ‘446, and thus Schreiber ‘446 cannot be a reference upon which the present application may be rejected. It is submitted that only the subject matter of Schreiber ‘446 which is in common to its earlier filed parent patent can be prior art, and a review of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,103 clearly shows that it does not contain all of the material relied upon by the Examiner to reject Claims 1-3, 12-15, and 17-19, at item 8, pages 4-6, of the Office Action of February 24, 2005. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection as being anticipated by Schreiber ‘446 is hence requested.

Claims 4, 5, 6-8, 9-11, and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable in view of Schreiber ‘446 in combination with either U.S. Patent Nos. 6,584,199 (Kim et al.), 5,734,380 (Adams et al.), or U.S. Patent No. 6,477,504 (Hamlin et al.). As Schreiber ‘446 is not a prior art reference, then it cannot be combined with Kim et al., Adams et al., or Hamlin et. al. to reject Claims 4, 5, 6-8, 9-11, and 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Claims 20 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884 (Dedrick). Claim 20 describes sending a survey to a computer via the Internet which references a network address to obtain a file for the survey, and downloading that

file from the network address. It appears the Examiner contends that Dedrick's user profile transmitted for storage in the user's portable profile storage device from a user profile server, and later transmission of updates made by the user at their PC to the profile server as shown in FIG. 9, describes the claimed survey and the encrypted file of the survey. This is based on the Examiner's reliance on Dedrick at column 20 which relates to FIG. 9, and Examiner's statement made at item 5 of the Office Action. As the Examiner will appreciate, in Dedrick there is only but one user profile transmitted to the user, and later updated to profile server for each user (see FIG. 9, and column 20 at lines 4-28). This is not comparable to the two claimed elements of (i) a survey, and (ii) a file requested for that survey, since in Dedrick there is one user profile transmitted, stored, or updated for a user at his or her client device 12 (e.g., PC). Accordingly, Dedrick does not show each and every element of Claim 20, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 20 and 22-25 is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Adams et al. Claim 21 depends on base Claim 20, which for reasons argued above is patentable over Dedrick. Adams fails to suggest that which is absent in Dedrick of Claim 20. Thus, Claim 21 is patentable over Dedrick and Adams, either alone or in combination, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 21 is requested.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,818,935 (Maa). Claim 26 describes each of the computer systems as having a display and a user interface in which, when a file is played, signals from the user interface at the second computer system are ignored which enable access to the decrypted file, and when another window is selected than the window displaying the decrypted file, disables the playing of the decrypted file. The Examiner contends that Maa describes the claimed user interface at column 11, lines 28-60, which is set forth below:

Specific requirements for an embodiment of the Internet information pointer encoder with a UNICODE encoded text message for NTSC video include the following:

- (1) Assign the format codeword corresponding to UNICODE.
- (2) Encode the text message with UNICODE, and thereby allowing any language supported by UNICODE to be used for text message.
- (3) Use one of the closed-captioning and text channels for transporting the Internet information pointers. In principle, any of these captioning and text channels can serve to transport the Internet information pointer, but in practice, the closed-captioning channel CC3 is preferred so as to avoid potential conflict

with the normal closed-captioning text in channel CC1.

(4) The following steps are used to map an Internet information pointer onto a closed-caption channel:

(a) Use the standard preamble control code for the caption text to lead each caption text row.

(b) Insert at most one Internet information pointer into a caption text row and align the beginning of the Internet information pointer with the beginning of a closed-caption text row.

(c) If an Internet information pointer is longer than 32 bytes, break it into 32-byte chunks with the last chunk containing 32 bytes or less. Place the chunks into consecutive caption text rows.

(d) Except for the preamble control code, do not use any other control codes defined for normal closed-caption text in the text row that transports an Internet information pointer or chunk.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above citation does not appear relevant to a user interface playing a decrypted file, such that when another window is selected than the window displaying the decrypted file, the playing of the decrypted file is disabled. Maa clearly does not describe the claimed user interface. Thus, Maa does not disclose each and every element of Claim 26 required for anticipation, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,102,287 (Matyas, Jr.) "Matyas". It is the Examiner's position that Matyas sends encrypted information file to computers to carry out a survey. However, this is not the case in Matyas when a buyer requests a product survey questionnaire from evaluator 50. The survey questions sent to buyers at steps 66-67 are clearly not encrypted (see column 14, lines 44-56). In fact, Matyas describes step 68 at column 15, line 53, to column 16, line 45, that it is the buyer's survey questionnaire responses which may be encrypted, not the survey questions as the Examiner appears to contend. As Matyas states at column 16, lines 30-31, "Encrypting the survey_questionnaire_responses allows the buyer 10 to keep his responses secret". Encryption of the survey questions would not promote this purpose.

It is the Examiner's position that Claim 3 of Matyas describes sending output encrypted surveys (see item 5, fifth paragraph, on page 2 of the Office Action of February 24, 2005). Actually, Claim 3 describes providing product survey information to a prospective buyer. Product survey information is the result of survey responses from other buyers (see base Claim 1 which describes "product survey information" used in dependent Claim 3). As Matyas states in its Abstract "[A]n additional entity, an evaluator, collects product survey information from

buyers that have previously purchased products from the seller and provides product survey information to prospective buyers upon request.” Any other interpretation of dependent Claim 3 would be contrary to Matyas. Thus, Matyas cannot anticipate Claim 27 or its dependent Claim 29. For reasons argued with respect to Claim 27, Matyas also does not anticipate Claim 30 or its dependent Claims 31-32.

Also, Matyas fails to describe the Claim 28 means at each computer system for ignoring interrupts from a user interface device. It is the Examiner’s position that Matyas teaches rejecting interrupts (see page 2, last paragraph of item 5, of the Office Action of February 24, 2005). A word search of the entire Matyas patent failed to find one instance of the word “interrupt”. With respect to column 24, lines 4-32, relied upon the Examiner to reject Claim 28, this merely describes FIG. 19, which does not relate to ignoring interrupts from a user interface device. Thus, Matyas, Jr. also lacks each and every element of Claim 28 required for anticipation. In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 27-32 is requested.

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed September 26, 2002 with a PTO-1449 form listing one item. The Office Actions of February 24, 2005 and June 1, 2004 did not enclose a copy of the PTO-1449 form. Consideration of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

It is believed the Application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 24 2005



Kenneth J. LuKacher
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 38,539

South Winton Court
3136 Winton Road South, Suite 204
Rochester, New York 14623
Telephone: (585) 424-2670
Facsimile: (585) 424-6196